

10892/AGS/IBSS/HMM

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-42 are currently pending.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6-21, and 27-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan in view of Uehara. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

According to Chapter 2134 of the M.P.E.P., in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, "all the limitations must be taught or suggested." The Applicant submits that neither *Tan* nor *Uehara*, either singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests all the features recited in claims 1, 6-21, and 27-42.

More specifically, claim 1 recites "ultrasonicated said silicon carbide materials in an aqueous solution of inorganic acid" and "ultrasonicated said silicon carbide materials in a bath of de-ionized water." The Applicant submits that neither of the references discloses or suggests both of these features. *Tan* does not appear to disclose both ultrasonicated silicon carbide in an aqueous solution of an inorganic solution and ultrasonicated silicon carbide in de-ionized water. *Tan* only appears to discuss both in connection with quartz, not silicon carbide. *Uehara* does not appear to disclose ultrasonicated silicon carbide at all. Accordingly, no combination of *Tan* and *Uehara* appears to produce the Applicant's claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Tan* in view of *Uehara* and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-42 directly or indirectly depend on claim 1.

10892/AGS/IBSS/HMM

The Office Action also rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tan* in view of *Uehara* as applied to claims 1, 6-21, and 27-42 above, and further in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "the AAPA"). The Office Action also rejected claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tan* in view of *Uehara* as applied to claims 1, 6-21, and 27-42 above and further in view of *Kitabatake*. The Office Action also rejected claims 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tan* in view of *Uehara* as applied to claims 1, 6-21, and 27-42 above and further in view of *Lu* or *Laube*.

The Applicant respectfully submits that neither AAPA, *Kitabatake*, *Lu* nor *Laube* overcomes the deficiencies of the *Tan* and *Uehara* references. For at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5 and 22-26 are also allowable.

#### Conclusion


The Applicant believes all the pending claims are in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the same.

The Applicant does not believe any fees are due regarding this amendment. If any fees are required, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

10892/AGS/IBSS/HMM

The Applicant encourages the Examiner to telephone Applicant's attorney to discuss the amendment should any issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dugan, Esq.  
Registration No. 41,720  
Dugan & Dugan, PC  
Attorneys for the Applicant  
(914) 332-9081

Dated: January 8, 2007  
Tarrytown, New York